

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

SODEXO v. Simo Kinnunen, Telcoin Pte. Ltd.

Case No. D2025-3494

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is SODEXO, France, represented by AREOPAGE, France.

The Respondent is Simo Kinnunen, Telcoin Pte. Ltd., Singapore.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <sodexocoupons.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Amazon Registrar, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 28, 2025. On August 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On August 29, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (“On behalf of sodexocoupons.com owner”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 1, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 5, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint and the amended Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Monica Novac as the sole panelist in this matter on October 17, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

#### 4. Factual Background

The Complainant is SODEXO, a French company established in 1966, which is one of the largest companies in the world specialized in food services and facilities management. The Complainant has 423,000 employees serving daily 80 million consumers in 45 countries. As of August 31, 2024, the Complainant's consolidated revenues reached EUR 23.8 billion. The Complainant is listed as one of "the World's Most Admired Companies" by FORTUNE Magazine.

Since 1982, the Complainant also operates in Singapore, where the Respondent is located.

The Complainant owns a large number of SODEXO/SODEXHO trademarks in various jurisdictions, including the following:

- International Trademark Registration No. 964615 *sodexo*<sup>\*</sup>, registered on January 8, 2008, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45, designating numerous jurisdictions, including Singapore;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1240316 SODEXO (word), registered on October 23, 2014, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45, designating several jurisdictions;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 008346462 SODEXO (word), registered on February 1, 2010, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 006104657 *sodexo*, registered on June 27, 2008, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45.

Previous UDRP panels have already recognized the well-known character of the SODEXO/SODEXHO trademarks.

The Complainant uses its SODEXO trademarks in relation to food services and facility management services.

The Complainant also owns several domain names corresponding to its brands, including, but not limited to <sodexo.com>, <uk.sodexo.com>, <sodexo.fr>, <sodexoca.com>, <sodexousa.com> and <cn.sodexo.com>.

The Respondent is Simo Kinnunen, Telcoin Pte. Ltd., apparently located in Singapore. The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on August 19, 2025, through a privacy service. As of the date of this Decision, when accessed by the Panel, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an inactive website.

#### 5. Parties' Contentions

##### A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's SODEXO trademarks;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; and
- the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and it is being used in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the Disputed Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the SODEXO trademark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel finds that the SODEXO trademark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Disputed Domain Name also contains the term "coupons", however the Panel finds that the addition of this element does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. According to the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

According to the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1, the gTLD ".com" in the Disputed Domain Name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Further to all the above, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a Disputed Domain Name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant

evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

It is accepted by the Panel that the Respondent is not related to the Complainant in any way and that the Complainant (itself or through its affiliates) has not licensed nor authorized the Respondent to register and use the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent does not hold any rights over SODEXO, including those that are earlier than the Complainant's rights in the SODEXO trademarks. Moreover, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

As noted above, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an inactive webpage. The Respondent has not brought any evidence that it has engaged in any demonstrable preparations to use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services as per the Policy. In view of the composition of the Disputed Domain Name and the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the Panel is of the opinion that the Disputed Domain Name is likely to mislead Internet users, and there is no evidence that the Respondent has been making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Further to all the above, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name after the Complainant registered and used its SODEXO trademark. In view of the global fame of the Complainant, as well as the well-known character of its SODEXO trademark and the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, it is unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's trademark and business when registering the Disputed Domain Name. In view of the above, the Panel considers that the Respondent targeted the Complainant when registering the Disputed Domain Name.

Regarding the use of the Disputed Domain Name, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Further to all the above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

## **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the Disputed Domain Name <sodexocoupons.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Monica Novac/*

**Monica Novac**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 26, 2025